

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. **If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, or believes that some or all of the claims are not in condition for allowance, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone Examiner Interview before any further actions on the merits.**

The applicants will now address each of the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 18, 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0086005 ("the Nakamura publication") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0193585 ("the Ogura publication"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,822,211 ("the Hagihara patent"). Please note that although the Examiner states these claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (See Paper No. 20090215, page 3.), it is clear that the Examiner meant to reject these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Independent claim 18, as amended, is not rendered obvious by the Nakamura publication, the Ogura publication and the Hagihara patent since the cited references neither teach, nor make obvious, **line memories** which are arranged between the pixels and the output channels and **which temporarily store pixel signals of the pixels selected and read out in the first driving mode and the second driving mode**. That is, the cited references do not teach, or make obvious, **line memories which store pixel signals in a plurality of driving modes**. In embodiments consistent with the claimed invention, an optimized image acquisition can be achieved by using line memories which store pixel signals in a plurality of driving modes. (See page 3, lines 1-13 and page 29, lines 15-20.) The amendment to claim 18 is supported, for example, by original claim 19 and Figure 1.

In rejecting previously presented claim 18, the Examiner concedes that the Nakamura and Ogura publications "do not specifically teach the line memories which are arranged between the pixels and the output channels and which temporarily store pixel signals of the pixels selected and read out in the first driving mode or the second driving mode. [Emphasis added.]" (Paper No. 20090215, page 5) The Examiner then cites 10 and G10 of Figure 1 and column 6, lines 18-54 of the Hagihara patent as teaching this feature.

However, the Hagihara patent does not disclose a **plurality of driving modes**. Accordingly, the Hagihara patent merely discloses a line memory that stores pixel signals **in a single mode**. Although the Hagihara patent depicts a line memory (10) in Figure 1, it does not

disclose a plurality of driving modes. In other words, this line memory merely stores odd-numbered column pixels and even-numbered column pixels, respectively, but **in one driving mode**. Accordingly, the Hagihara patent does not teach, or make obvious, "line memories...which temporarily store pixel signals of the pixels selected and read out in the first mode and the second driving mode" (i.e., line memories which store pixel signals **in a plurality of driving modes**).

Similarly, although the Ogura publication also describes a line memory (See 3104 and 3109 in Figure 11 of the Ogura publication.), the line memory apparently stores pixel signals **in one driving mode**. More specifically, the line memories described in the Ogura publication are considered to store odd-numbered column pixels and even-numbered column pixels, respectively, in one driving mode. Thus, the Ogura publication also does not teach, or make obvious, "line memories...which temporarily store pixel signals of the pixels selected and read out in the first mode and the second driving mode" (i.e., line memories which store pixel signals **in a plurality of driving modes**).

Furthermore, the purported teachings of the Nakamura publication fail to compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of the Hagihara patent and Ogura publication.

Thus, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent claim 18, as amended, is not rendered obvious by the Nakamura and Ogura publications in view of the Hagihara patent. Since claims 19, 21 and 22 depend from claim 18, these claims are similarly not rendered obvious by the cited references.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nakamura publication in view of the Ogura publication and the Hagihara patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,150,204 ("the Yasuyuki Yamazaki patent"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Since claim 20 depends from claim 18, it is not rendered obvious by the Nakamura publication, the Ogura publication and the Hagihara patent in view of the Yasuyuki Yamazaki patent since the purported teachings of the Yasuyuki Yamazaki patent would not compensate for the deficiencies of the Nakamura publication, the Ogura publication and the Hagihara patent with respect to claim 18, as amended (discussed above), regardless of the scope of the purported teachings of the Yasuyuki Yamazaki patent, and regardless of the absence or presence of an obvious reason to combine these references. Consequently, claim 20 is not rendered obvious by the cited references for at least this reason.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nakamura publication in view of the Ogura publication, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,286 ("the Yoshirou Yamazaki patent"). Please note that since claim 23 depends from claim 18, the applicants believe the Examiner meant to include the Hagihara patent in this rejection as well. The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Since claim 23 depends from claim 18, it is not rendered obvious by the Nakamura publication, the Ogura publication and the Hagihara patent in view of the Yoshirou Yamazaki patent since the purported teachings of the Yoshirou Yamazaki patent would not compensate for the deficiencies of the Nakamura publication, the Ogura publication and the Hagihara patent with respect to claim 18, as amended (discussed above), regardless of the scope of the purported teachings of the Yoshirou Yamazaki patent, and regardless of the absence or presence of an obvious reason to combine these references. Consequently, claim 23 is not rendered obvious by the cited references for at least this reason.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nakamura publication in view of the Ogura publication and the Hagihara patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0067416 ("the Yoneda publication"). The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Since claim 24 depends from claim 18, it is not rendered obvious by the Nakamura publication, the Ogura publication and the Hagihara patent in view of the Yoneda publication since the purported teachings of the Yoneda publication would not compensate for the deficiencies of the Nakamura publication, the Ogura publication and the Hagihara patent with respect to claim 18, as amended (discussed above), regardless of the scope of the purported teachings of the Yoneda publication, and regardless of the absence or presence of an obvious

reason to combine these references. Consequently, claim 24 is not rendered obvious by the cited references for at least this reason.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicants request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.


Any arguments made in this amendment pertain **only** to the specific aspects of the invention **claimed**. Any claim amendments or cancellations, and any arguments, are made **without prejudice to, or disclaimer of**, the applicant's right to seek patent protection of any unclaimed (e.g., narrower, broader, different) subject matter, such as by way of a continuation or divisional patent application for example.

Since the applicants' remarks, amendments, and/or filings with respect to the Examiner's objections and/or rejections are sufficient to overcome these objections and/or rejections, the applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action and/or to certain facts or conclusions that may be implied by objections and/or rejections in the Office Action (such as, for example, whether a reference constitutes prior art, whether references have been properly combined or modified, whether dependent claims are separately patentable, etc.) is not a concession by the applicants that such assertions and/or implications are accurate, and that all requirements for an objection and/or a

rejection have been met. Thus, the applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute any such assertions and implications in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

August 3, 2009



Leonard P. Linardakis, Attorney
Reg. No. 60,441
Tel.: (732) 936-1400

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (and any accompanying paper(s)) is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent Office on the date shown below.

Leonard P. Linardakis

Type or print name of person signing certification


Signature

August 3, 2009
Date